

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-7 are amended. The revision to claim 1 is supported, for example, at page 4, lines 27-34 in the specification. Claims 1-7 are also amended editorially to improve their form. Claims 1-7 are pending, with claim 1 being the sole independent claim.

Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5 stand rejected being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,059,173 (Sacco). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of determining a composition of an infusion line. Components for forming the infusion line are classified into unit groups. Units of each group are formed of one or more components having standardized shapes and sizes. At least one kind of the units from each of the unit groups are selected based on the determined combination of unit groups. By this arrangement, the composition of an infusion line easily can be adapted to various demands and requirements, while the standardization of components simplifies the production system and reduces costs. *See, e.g.*, page 8, lines 21-27 of the specification.

Sacco does not disclose or suggest at least the above features. Sacco relates to a method of administering multiple intravenous fluids to a patient. However, Sacco does not teach or suggest the standardization of shapes and sizes. Nor does Sacco teach or suggest the classification, selection, and arrangement of components of an infusion line as recited in claim 1.

Applicant therefore submits that claim 1 is allowable over Sacco. Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and are believed allowable for the same reasons.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,552,556 (Urquhart). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Urquhart also does not disclose or suggest at least the above features. Like Sacco, Urquhart relates to a method of administering multiple intravenous fluids to a patient. However, Urquhart does not teach or suggest the standardization of shapes and sizes. Nor does Urquhart teach or suggest the classification, selection, and arrangement of components of an infusion line as recited in claim 1.

Applicant therefore submits that claim 1 is allowable over Urquhart. Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and are believed allowable for the same reasons.

Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Sacco in view of Urquhart. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.


Claims 6 and 7 depend from allowable claim 1. Urquhart does not remedy the deficiencies of Sacco as noted above. Accordingly, Applicant therefore submits that claims 6 and 7 are also allowable over the cited reference. Applicant does not concede the correctness of this rejection.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: November 19, 2003



Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300
DPM:DTL